

From: "Mick Staton" <mjr@caplink.com>
To: <lneri@loudoun.gov>, <bos@loudoun.gov>
Date: 12/9/2005 12:51:24 PM
Subject: Issues to discuss on Saturday

Issues to discuss for Western Zoning Proposals

1. Requirement of the minimum 15 acre rural economy lot.

I have heard a repeated theme about allowing more flexibility in the new zoning ordinance and I have felt that this requirement for the cluster option as well as in the Rural Residential districts takes away from that flexibility. There are already requirements that in the Rural Residential districts that either 70% or 85% of the land must be comprised of rural economy lots or open space. Requiring the creation of one lot that is a certain size seems to go against that flexibility.

2. Limiting Uses on Lots on Rural Economy Lots in the Rural Residential zoning districts.

One of the main stated goals of the new zoning districts has been the protection and the enhancement of the rural economy. In the Rural Residential Districts, the allowed uses on the rural residential lots have been greatly reduced, and the uses on the rural economy lots have been reduced, ostensibly to protect the residential lots from having to put up with the noise, smells, etc. that may be associated with rural economy uses. To me, this goes against the very principle of protecting and enhancing the rural economy.

Life in a rural area brings with it certain aspects that must be expected, and to limit rural uses on land adjacent to residential uses simply because the landowner is trying to achieve maximum density goes against the idea of protection and enhancement of the rural economy. Furthermore, taken to its extreme, if we work under the same assumptions used by staff to determine a maximum build-out scenario where all landowners work to achieve maximum density, then most of the rural economy uses will be removed from most of the available land in Western Loudoun.

3. Process for Minor Rezoning

One of the concepts discussed during the summer was a modified process for re-zonings deemed to be 'minor' in nature. I would like to have a discussion on this process to make sure that we would not be skipping any important considerations.

4. Accessory Dwellings in Rural Zoning Districts

There are a number of accessory dwelling units that are available to be built by-right in the existing and proposed AR districts. These include:

Accessory Dwelling

Caretaker's Residence

Guest House

Co-Housing

Dormitory, Seasonal Labor

Rooming House

Tenant Dwelling

Tenant Dwelling, Seasonal Labor

It is my understanding that as lot sizes increase, the ability to create more and more of these accessory style dwellings increases. With decreased lot yields, more people may decide to build more of these accessory dwellings, creating more housing units on a single lot. It has also been discussed that providing people the ability to build these accessory dwellings and then allow them to be leased will give landowners the ability to generate income to augment revenues from a rural economy use.

There are two problems I have with this. The first is that it creates multiple units on a single lot; something that I fear is fraught with problems in the future. The second problem is that it seems to go against the idea of reducing residential densities in a way that would be worse than if the individual lot yields were reduced to 1 unit per five acres or even on unit per three acres. If a single large lot can produce multiple units, then the projected maximum build-out would in essence be

A-449

relatively unchanged from that of an A-3 build-out scenario. The only difference would be that under an A-3 scenario the units would be on individual lots, allowing individual ownership, whereas under the currently proposed scenario, multiple units would be on single lots, preventing individual ownership of these homes and creating a pseudo-permanent rental class in Western Loudoun.

5. Limestone Overlay District

In discussions with both staff and Supervisor Kurtz, we were looking at revising and updating the Limestone Overlay District into the zoning ordinance. I have some concerns that the previously approved language was too restrictive, but I think we should have some sort of requirements regarding limestone deposits and the danger of sinkholes they represent. If we are going to be revising the zoning ordinance, then this might be a good time to revise and update that language.

6. Family Subdivision

As mentioned on Wednesday night, I would like to see the current and proposed changes to the family subdivision ordinance. Allowing landowners more flexibility for their family members should be included in the new zoning ordinance provisions.

Mick Staton

A-450